DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 128 HE 015 535

AUTHOR Holsenbeck, Daniel C.; Tiffany, David M.
TITLE A Survey of Legislative Attitudes and Influence Factors on Higher Education in Alabama: 1980.
PUB DATE 15 Feb 82
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Southeastern District III Conference, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (February 15, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Information Sources; Interpersonal Relationship; Interprofessional Relationship; *Legislators; Public Opinion; *School Attitudes; *State Departments of Education

ABSTRACT

The attitudes of current and former Alabama legislators and educators toward higher education were surveyed. Attention was directed to current attitudes about higher education and changes in attitudes in the last 10 years, along with views on the influence of information sources. Questionnaire respondents were asked how accurate and responsive state educational agencies are to their inquiries about higher education, and how much influence information sources have on their general feelings and attitudes toward higher education. An additional question sought to determine the relationship, if any, between feelings about elementary/secondary education and higher education. Specifically, the effectiveness of information provided by the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, the State Department of Education, and the universities were investigated. Using a Likert scale, respondents rated the influence of 25 factors including the Alabama Education Association (a quasi-union), campus newspapers, faculty and student contacts, institutional executives, trusted friends, and the Governor's staff, among other influences. The summaries of responses to the questionnaire are appended. Overall, current members of the Alabama Legislature appeared to have a supportive attitude toward higher education. It is suggested that the favorable attitude is generated and maintained by the legislators' previous personal experiences and their present and future personal contacts with friends, educators, and students. In comparing attitudes over a 10-year period, 67 percent of the educators expressed the opinion that legislative attitudes today were less favorable than 10 years ago. The majority of both groups of legislators, however, disagreed to some extent that their favorable attitudes had declined. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222128

A SURVEY OF LEGISLATIVE ATTITUDES AND INFLUENCE FACTORS ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN ALABAMA: 1980

By

Daniel C. Holsenbeck

and

David M. Tiffany

HE 015 535

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David M. Tiffany

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Southeastern District III Conference,
Council for the Advancement and Support of Education,
February 15, 1982

"You can't take politics out of politics. . . or education," as the old saying goes. Certainly that is the case in Alabama and probably most of the states as well. In 1978-79, the State of Alabama expended $3,016,469,669 billion dollars for the functions of state government. Of this total 44.57% was spent directly or indirectly for educational activities. In the eyes of many, some of these dollars were itemized for specious educational activities but nonetheless survived the legislative process.

With these kind of dollars available in a relatively poor state (Alabama ranks 48 of 50 states in terms of 1979 per capita income according to Commerce Department figures released on May 10, 1980) and the press of events which will be discussed as we proceed, it is no wonder that the politics of education is alive and well in Alabama! Of particular interest to the authors are the status of higher education in the political milieu and the means or methods which will enhance that status. What is the general attitude of the actors in the political process towards the colleges and universities and what factors impress these actors with most efficiency and effectiveness? To answer these questions was the primary objective of a questionnaire mailed to former legislators, current members of the Alabama Senate and House of Representatives, and a group of our colleagues considered among the most influential educators in the state.

Of the research available by political scientists and others it is evident that there is growing interest as to "what factors influence legislative attitudes and why." Aufderheide writes that "it can be safely assumed that state legislatures play the most vital role in the determination of educational policy . . . To assess the pattern of relationships and influence between interest groups and legislators, it is desirable to attempt to discover not only which groups are most influential, but also why they appear to be so" (1976, pp. 202-203). Although we can only draw conclusions as to "why" legislators or educators

perceive certain factors or interest groups as being most effective and efficient in the lobbying process in Alabama, the data herein described attempt to enhance "efforts to understand and explain the complexities of interest-group politics and legislative politics . . ." (Ziegler, p. xvii).

THE FLORIDA SURVEY

In 1977, Robert L. Scott completed "A Study of the Sources of Legislative Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Higher Education in the State of Florida." Scott's research problems were 1) to identify the most influential information sources relative to the formulation of individual legislator attitudes toward higher education; 2) to determine the same for various education agency personnel exclusive of university employees; and 3) to see whether these education executives "have an accurate appreciation of which information sources legislators believe are most credible and persuasive" (1977, p. 2).

According to Scott's review of existing research and our own investigations, there are few studies which focus directly on legislative attitudes towards higher education and the influential factors involved. Scott's study is, in his own words, primarily "a study of perception and attitude sources, rather than a study of perceptions and attitudes, per se" (1977, p. 64). The most important conclusions from both the Florida and Alabama surveys are those that relate to the importance of various influential information sources although limited data on attitude changes does come from the first part of the survey instrument.

Scott's study concluded that legislative perceptions in Florida had become less favorable during the 10 year period preceeding his survey. We did not find the same attitude decline in Alabama. State agency personnel perceptions relative to attitudes and influential factors did disagree with legislative data in both Florida and Alabama. The evaluation of information sources by both groups of legislators in both states is quite similar giving a great deal of credibility to future utilization of these sources by the

institutions in their courtship of favorable legislative treatment. Scott found that the most influential sources were those which "involve personal contact, such as expert colleagues, hearings, family experiences, trusted friends, constituents, and contacts with faculty and executives" (1977, p. 162).

In the Alabama study overview to follow, we have utilized (with Scott's permission) much of the methodology, format, hypothesis, and reporting procedure of the Florida study. That many of the results in two dissimilar states (relative to the legislatures) are comparable is extremely valuable information for the leaders of postsecondary education.

THE ALABAMA SURVEY

Using a format very similar to that employed by Scott in Florida, the authors developed a questionnaire seeking specific answers to the following broad inquiries:

A. 1. What are your current attitudes about higher education and how have those feelings changed in the last 10 years?

2. How accurate and responsive are certain state educational agencies to your inquiries about higher education?

B. How much influence do certain information sources have on your general feelings and attitudes toward higher education?

Under Part A-1, four questions dealt with general feelings now (just prior to the 1980 Regular Session of the Alabama Legislature), 2, 5, and 10 years ago. A fifth question sought to determine the relationship, if any, between feelings about elementary/secondary and higher education. Three questions surveying the effectiveness of information provided by the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, the State Department of Education, and the universities themselves determine the conclusions for Part A-2. Part B provided very interesting and applicable data particularly for any student of lobbying or legislative influence. Employing a Likert scale (because of this technique's inherent

informative value and to be consistent with the Florida survey), the respondents were asked to rate the influence of 25 factors including the Alabama Education Association (a quasi-union), campus newspapers, faculty and student contacts, institutional executives, trusted friends, the Governor's staff, and so on. The complete questionnaire is attached as Appendix I.

As previously referenced, the respondents were grouped into three classes: former legislators from the 1975-78 Legislature who did not seek reelection or were not reelected to the 1979-82 Legislature, all current members, and a carefully selected group of 80 Alabama educators. These latter individuals consisted of the university presidents, several of their key staff, various commission and board members, and agency administrators. Selections were based on the author's knowledge of key individuals in the agencies and institutions. Forty-seven of the current members of the House and Senate replied, not a high percentage but not unexpected for this type of survey. Questionnaires were mailed to 75 former legislators with 25 replying, almost the exact same percentage return as the current body. In Scott's Florida survey, there were no comparisons between current and former legislators so this format adds a new and revealing dimension to legislative attitude assessment.

Unquestionably, the significance of our results is only as good as the sample. Based on the small number of returns, there is no way to be certain that our sample is a complete or fair representation of any of these groups. It is possible that only those legislators favorable toward higher education had enough interest to respond. Except for the percentage of completed and returned questionnaires, our only indications of broad representation are the range of geographical dispersion manifested by the return postmarks.

STATISTICAL COMMENTS

To establish statistical significance for the responses, the following null hypothesis was tested for each survey item:

> The percentage of responses to preference ratings on attitudes about higher education and related information sources by the former legislators (FL), current legislators (CL), and university leaders (UL) are not different.

The statistical test of chi squares was used with an alpha level established at .05. In several cases the null hypothesis cannot be rejected statistically but the responses are so homogenous that application of the chi squares test is meaningless.

Chi squares were determined for five different sets of responses, either "strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree" or "very little, little, moderate, strong, very strong." The results are summarized in the tables in Appendix II in the order of their chi square values. Tables A and B identify responses with statistically significant differences when all three groups of respondents and all five categories of answers were evaluated together. Tables C through I inclusive indicate replies with statistically significant differences when the three groups of respondents are still used, but in order to reduce the number of cells with less than five responses, the answers on either side of "undecided" or "moderate" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for each group, i.e., "agree, undecided, or disagree." Tables J through O inclusive indicate the statistically significant differences when the same three categories of answers are evaluated for "current legislators" and "university leaders." In all, there are fifteen questions in which the chi squares indicated a statistically significant result. The null hypothesis in these cases is therefore rejected, i.e., there is wide enough disparity in responses among the three groups that we can conclude a significant difference in opinion.

DISCUSSION

Tabulating across all three groups, it is encouraging to note that 81% of the responses indicated a favorable impression relative to higher education at the time the survey was taken in November and December of 1979. Of the current legislators, 87.2% harbored favorable attitudes as opposed to 69.3% of the educators who felt the legislators were so favorably inclined. It is intriguing that in many instances throughout the survey the educators perceived a much bleaker attitude on the part of legislators toward higher education or misjudged those factors which appear to influence the solons. Scott found this educator pessimism to be true in his Florida survey also.

Comparing attitudes over a 10 year period, 67% of the educators expressed the opinion that legislative attitudes today were "less favorable than 10 years ago." The majority of both groups of legislators, however, disagreed to some extent that their favorable attitudes had declined. Why does such a disparity or pessimistic view prevail on the part of educators when the legislators indicate such positive reactions? Given all the events which have impacted Alabama in the last three years, economically and politically, it is understandable that those closest to the process of education, i.e., the respondents in our educational group, would so react. Perhaps they feel the realities of the end of the "golden decade" for higher education, the apprehension of working with a new governor and administration in a different political milieu, or the rapidly depleting resources in the Alabama Special Education Trust Fund. The survey, unfortunately, does not tell us why this attitude is prevalent among the educators.

The question relating to the dependency of attitudes about higher education on feelings about elementary and secondary education produced total results almost equally divided between the agree and disagree spectrum. A greater proportion of former

legislators (52%) agreed with the dependency as opposed to a smaller group (46%) of the current legislative membership. Since much has been written and speculated about the strength of the Alabama Education Association and its influence on the legislative process, these results may verify current thinking that AEA is not as effective in the Legislature as in previous years, particularly before the last elections in 1978. Admittedly the difference (6%) is small. Since AEA is dominated almost entirely by elementary and secondary teachers, the legislator who favors AEA and its policies would appear to yield to AEA's influence on matters relating to higher education.

Although AEA has unquestionably had an impact on all matters related to elementary and secondary education, the same cannot be said for the coordinating agency for postsecondary education, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE). The acronym ACHE has aptly and disappointingly described the attitude toward the agency manifested by many educators, legislators, and state officials. The responses to the question seeking attitudes towards the ability of ACHE to provide accurate and comprehensive information on education relative to legislative inquiry indicate that ACHE has a serious credibility problem. The quality of ACHE information was uncertain or suspect to 73.9% of the current legislative group. The university leaders indicated similar feelings in 57.1% of the responses. The former legislators were almost equally as discouraging in their attitude towards this agency.

Despite ACHE's inability to control waste, and duplication, or to bring about rational budgeting, regulate off-campus course proliferation and other issues prior to the time of this survey, it has provided some pertinent and valuable data on the loose "system" of higher education in Alabama. This data collection and dissemination proficiency is recognized by some university leaders and some of the former legislators who were obviously exposed longer to ACHE and its activities in a formal capacity. The current legislators either do not share similar feelings to the same extent or have not

been exposed long enough to ACHE to see much credibility in its activities. The distribution of responses lends some credence to these conclusions. This discussion about ACHE is perhaps not as important to the pure research conclusions of the survey but does weigh heavily on the realities of the educational milieu in Alabama.

The State Department of Education and the universities fare much better in the eyes of all three groups when it comes to providing "accurate and comprehensive information in response to requests from the Legislature regarding higher education." Only 47.8% of the current legislative group were undecided or in disagreement with the Department's efforts at communication. Fifty-two and two tenths percent of the current legislators felt that the accuracy of information furnished by the State Department was appropriate, while only 24.4% of the university leaders so agreed. This again points to a disparity between the views held by the current legislators and key educators who should be more cognizant of legislative opinion. Practically the same percentage (51%) of the current legislature also agree that the accuracy of information provided by the universities themselves in the legislative process is appropriate. As anticipated, the educators rate the quality of their information much higher than does the elected body.

INFLUENCE FACTORS

Perhaps the most useful information retrieved from the Alabama survey was the relative importance of 25 factors influencing individual legislative attitudes towards higher education. The items chosen were based primarily on common sense and the authors' direct experiences as lobbyists for their respective universities. The Scott survey in Florida utilized 25 items of similar nature.

Table One displays the 25 items in percentage rank order of influence by the current legislators. The figures in columns one, two and three represent the cumulative totals of those respondents indicating that they either agreed or strongly agreed that this

particular item had a positive influence on their attitudes. As in all previous discussions, the current legislators are represented by CL, former legislators by FL, and educators by UL for university leaders. Table Two displays the 25 factors in rank order only with comparative rankings of the factors by the three groups.

All three groups agree that the strongest single factor influencing their attitudes toward higher education is their innate opinion created over a lifetime of experience. This is a reasonable expectation because the total respondent population is generally well educated and professionally successful. Regardless of their education or success, however, one would expect years of personal experience to have some effect on general feelings. The second most important factor was a trusted friend other than a fellow legislator. Interestingly enough, the educators rated constituency pressure third while current legislators rated this factor sixth. The legislator's personal specific experience as a student or close involvement with a member of the immediate family, who was a student, was rated second by FL, third by CL, and fourth by UL.

One of the greatest disparities in answers relates to the current legislators' fourth most important item. Committee hearings were obviously important to CL but considerably down the lists for FL and UL who rated the factors seventeenth and twelfth respectively. Despite the relatively high influence given committee hearings by the current legislative membership, other studies have concluded "testimony at hearings to be the least effective direct method of communication" (Zeigler, p. 175). There was relative agreement that personal contacts with educational executives were important. College and university lobbyists faired less favorably than their executive superiors, but were nonetheless relatively high in the ranking order of influence factors.

On the negative side of the results, it is easy to pinpoint the least effective influences at least in the eyes of the survey population. Rated least effective by current legislators were various public relations tools, e.g., radio/TV news, university advertise-

ments, campus newspapers or magazine items on higher education. Of much interest is the opinion of the CL concerning the influence of the Alabama Education Association on legislation pertinent to higher education. Educators in the colleges and universities tend to rate the AEA influence much higher than either CL or FL. The current elected officials rate AEA 19/25 while the educators move them to 9/25.

Another similar disparity in opinion between CL and UL related to the perceived influence of the Governor and his aides on the legislative process relative to higher education. Note that CL rate this item 18/25 while UL rate it 8/25. While the current legislature is influenced by the Governor and his aides more than FL, in each case a majority are in the "very little" and "little" categories. University leaders misread the influence situation probably due to a lack of understanding of the separation of powers and responsibilities in daily interface between the executive and legislative branches. Until the closing days of the 1980 regular legislative session, the Governor had not posted many legislative victories. Our data imply that the Governor clearly influences educators more than the legislators.

Another significant discrepancy in opinion occurs in the relative influence of personal contact by legislators with faculty or visits to college campuses. Educators seem to underestimate the importance of these two information sources. A similar result was evident from Scott's survey of the Florida legislature. Educators may also underrate the influence and potential of student contact with legislators. Former legislators rated student contact much higher than either of the other two groups.

SUMMARY

This 1979-80 legislative attitude survey relative to higher education provides useful information within the statistical and descriptive limitations of the data. It provides a reasonably sound foundation for expectation of a favorable attitude by the legislature

toward higher education and further indicates those information sources which appear to have significant influence on the elected officials. The rejection of the null hypothesis relative to the three survey groups on certain questions indicate that there is some difference of opinion among current legislators, former legislators and educators. Knowing the extent of these differences should provide for better educator/legislator communication.

If one could summarize the entire survey into a few words, it could probably be said that the current members of the Alabama Legislature have a healthy and supportive attitude towards higher education. The issues in the last few hours of the 1980 regular session demonstrated that support as numerous attempts by certain legislative factions to decrease appropriations for the universities were defeated. Furthermore, the survey implies that the favorable attitude is generated and maintained by the legislator's previous personal experiences and their present and future personal contacts with friends, educators and students. Other studies have confirmed that "Both legislator and lobbyist rate personal communication as the most effective technique" (Zeigler, p. 174).

Politics and issues have a way of changing quickly so there is no way to predict the continuing relative influence of the 25 information sources or the favorable attitudes of the legislators. Courtesy, common sense, and selected factual communication are the characteristics of the most effective public relations tools. This survey provides a hint to educators on the tools that might have the most influence on the legislature but the degree of courtesy, common sense, and truth in information are completely controlled by the educators themselves.

> If American postsecondary education is to remain viable, its practitioners must first understand the implications of the political terrain and the impact of political systems upon the educational enterprise and upon individual institutions and organizations. In order to develop this understanding, a body of research and knowledge must be developed (Blocher, p. 210).

APPENDIX I

TABLE ONE

Information Source Influence

	CL*	FL*	UL*
1. Lifetime experience	78.7%	76.0%	81.3%
2. Trusted friend	69.7%	60.0%	79.1%
3. Educational experience	66.0%	76.0%	75.0%
4. Committee hearings	48.9%	16.0%	33.3%
5. University executives	46.8%	44.0%	56.3%
6. Constituents	44.7%	36.0%	79.1%
7. Legislative colleagues	40.5%	28.0%	54.2%
8. Campus visits	40.0%	52.0%	31.2%
9. University lobbyists	36.1%	52.1%	50.0%
10. Faculty	34.1%	48.0%	27.1%
11. State Superintendent	31.9%	16.0%	20.8%
12. Agency information	29.8%	20.0%	41.4%
13. Floor debates	27.7%	4.2%	10.4%
14. Students	23.4%	40.0%	16.3%
15. Other states	19.1%	8.0%	4.2%
16. Legislative interns	16.9%	16.7%	10.4%
17. ACHE	15.1%	20.0%	10.4%
18. Governor	15.2%	4.0%	50.0%
19. AEA	14.9%	20.0%	47.0%
20. Legislative employers	10.6%	12.5%	22.9%
21. Civic organizations	10.6%	16.7%	20.4%
22. Radio/TV	10.6%	20.0%	32.7%
23. Newspapers/magazines	8.5%	16.0%	42.8%
24. Campus newspapers	6.4%	4.2%	0.0%
25. University advertising	2.1%	12.5%	4.1%

*Cumulative percentage "strong" or "very strong"

TABLE TWO

Information Source Rank Order

		CL	FL	UL
a.	Lifetime experience	1	1	1*
b.	Trusted friend	2	3	2
c.	Educational experience	3	2	4
d.	Committee hearings	4	17	12*
e.	University executives	5	7	5
f.	Constituents	6	9	3
g.	Legislative colleagues	7	10	6
h.	Campus visits	8	5	14*
i.	University lobbyists	9	4	7
j.	Faculty	10	6	15*
k.	State Superintendent	11	16	17*
l.	Agency information	12	11	11
m.	Floor debates	13	24	21*
n.	Students	14	8	19*
o.	Other states	15	22	23*
p.	Legislative interns	16	15	20
q.	ACHE	17	12	22*
r.	Governor	18	25	8*
s.	AEA	19	21	9*
t.	Legislative employers	20	19	16
u.	Civic organizations	21	14	18
v.	Radio/TV	22	13	13*
w.	Newspapers/magazines	23	18	10*
x.	Campus newspapers	24	23	25
y.	University advertising	25	20	24

*Factors with most interesting results.

APPENDIX II

Table A

Question A2 - Feelings less favorable than ten years ago (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Strongly Agree	8.0%	8.5%	14.3%
Agree	20.0%	25.5%	53.1%
Undecided	4.0%	10.6%	14.3%
Disagree	48.0%	44.7%	16.3%
Strongly Disagree	20.0%	10.6%	2.0%

Chi Square = 23.47 with 8 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0028

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for each group, the statistical results were:

Chi Square = 21.87 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0002

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 14.45 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0007

Table B

Question B3 - News items re higher education in other states (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Very little	28.0%	29.8%	20.8%
Little	28.0%	14.9%	45.8%
Moderate	36.0%	36.2%	29.2%
Strong	8.0%	19.1%	4.2%

Chi Square = 13.98 with 6 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0298

When the answers on either side of 'undecided' are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators' and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 7.02 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0299

Table C

Question B25 - Influence of Governor and his aides (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	68.0%	52.2%	12.5%
Moderate	28.0%	32.6%	37.5%
Strong	4.0%	15.2%	50.0%

Chi Square = 33.07 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0000

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 20.36 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0000

Table D

Question B6 - Influence of A.E.A. (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	60.0%	66.0%	16.3%
Moderate	28.0%	19.1%	36.7%
Strong	12.0%	14.9%	46.9%

Chi Square = 29.28 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0000

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 25.07 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0000

Table E

Question B16 - Influence of floor debates (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	75.0%	29.8%	33.3%
Moderate	20.8%	42.6%	56.3%
Strong	4.2%	27.7%	10.4%

Chi Square = 20.69 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0004

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 13.78 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0010

Table F

Question B9 - Influence of constituents (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	20.0%	12.8%	4.2%
Moderate	44.0%	42.6%	16.7%
Strong	36.0%	44.7%	79.2%

Chi Square = 17.62 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0015

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 12.03 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0024

Table G

Question B17 - Influence of committee hearings (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	44.0%	14.9%	22.9%
Moderate	40.0%	36.2%	43.8%
Strong	16.0%	48.9%	33.3%

Chi Square = 11.19 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0245

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 10.31 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0058

Table H

Question B1 - Influence of radio and TV (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	48.0%	66.0%	34.7%
Moderate	32.0%	23.4%	32.7%
Strong	20.0%	10.6%	32.7%

Chi Square = 11.00 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0266

When the answers on either side of "undecided" are grouped so that there are only three categories of answers for "current legislators" and "university leaders", the statistical results were:

Raw Chi Square = 10.73 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0047

Table I

Question B13 - Influence of expert colleague (in percentages)

	Former Legislators	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	16.0%	29.8%	10.4%
Moderate	56.0%	29.8%	35.4%
Strong	28.0%	40.4%	54.2%

Raw Chi Square = 10.64 with 4 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0309

Table J

Question B2 - Influence of newspaper items on higher education in Alabama (in percentages)

	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	46.8%	20.4%
Moderate	44.7%	38.8%
Strong	8.5%	40.8%

Raw Chi Square = 15.23 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0005

Table K

Question A3 - Feelings - less favorable today than 5 years ago (in percentages)

	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Agree	38.3%	73.5%
Undecided	8.5%	10.2%
Disagree	53.2%	16.3%

Raw Chi Square = 14.83 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0006

Table L

Question A4 – Feelings - less favorable today than 2 years ago (in percentages)

	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Agree	23.4%	53.1%
Undecided	10.6%	8.2%
Disagree	66.0%	38.8%

Raw Chi Square = 9.03 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0209

Table M

Question B14 - Influence - trusted friend (in percentages)

	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Little	14.9%	0.0%
Moderate	25.5%	20.8%
Strong	59.6%	79.2%

Raw Chi Square = 8.68 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0130

Table N

Question A7 - Accuracy of information from State Department of Education (in percentages)

	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Agree	52.2%	24.5%
Undecided	26.1%	38.8%
Disagree	21.7%	36.7%

Raw Chi Square = 7.77 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0205

Table O

Question A5 - Feelings on higher education not related to feelings on elementary and secondary education (in percentages)

	Current Legislators	University Leaders
Agree	46.8%	46.9%
Undecided	2.1%	16.3%
Disagree	51.1%	36.7%

Raw Chi Square = 6.28 with 2 Degrees of Freedom Significance = 0.0432

References

Aufderheide, J. Alan. "Educational Interest Groups and the State Legislature." In State Policy Making for the Public Schools. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Blocher, Clyde E., Bender, Louis W., and Martorana, S.V. The Political Terrain of American Postsecondary Education. Fort Lauderdale: Nova University Press, 1975.

Jewell, Malcolm E. The State Legislature: Politics and Practice. New York: Random House, 1969.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.

Scott, Robert Lorne. "A Study of Legislative Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Higher Education in the State of Florida." Ph.D. dissertation, The Florida State University, 1977.

Zeigler, Harmon, and Baer, Michael. Lobbying: Interaction and Influence in American State Legislatures. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.